

OFFICE OF SYSTEMS INTEGRATION

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL OSI 7100-181 UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE MODERNIZATION PROJECT



SECTION 9 – EVALUATION

June 1, 2007
Addendum 1

ISSUED BY:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITIONS SECTION
707 3RD STREET, 2ND FLOOR
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA 95605

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

| [2347_37.DOC](#)

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

Deleted: Section 9 – Evaluation

Table of Contents

(Section 9 – Evaluation)

9	EVALUATION	4
9.1	INTRODUCTION	4
9.2	EVALUATION TEAM.....	4
9.3	PROPOSAL PROCESS.....	4
9.3.1	<i>Submission Review</i>	4
9.3.2	<i>Draft Proposal Review</i>	5
9.3.3	<i>Confidential Discussion</i>	5
9.3.4	<i>Final Proposal Review</i>	5
9.4	PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORING (TOTAL SCORE).....	7
9.4.1	<i>Scoring Thresholds</i>	9
9.5	FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION SCORING (5,000 POINTS).....	9
9.5.1	<i>Corporate Capability Evaluation</i>	9
9.5.2	<i>Key Staff Evaluation</i>	11
9.5.3	<i>Technical Proposal Evaluation</i>	15
9.5.4	<i>Functional Scoring Determination</i>	21
9.6	COST EVALUATION SCORING (5,000 POINTS)	21
9.6.1	<i>Evaluation for Compliance to RFP Requirements</i>	22
9.6.2	<i>Cost Scoring Determination</i>	24
9.7	DETERMINATION OF WINNING PROPOSAL	25

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

Deleted: Section 9 – Evaluation

Table of Tables (Section 9 – Evaluation)

TABLE 9.1 – EVALUATION SCORING SUMMARY	8
TABLE 9.2 - CORPORATE CAPABILITY SCORING	9
TABLE 9.3 - CORPORATE CAPABILITY SCORES	9
TABLE 9.4 - CORPORATE CAPABILITY REFERENCE CHECK SCORES	11
TABLE 9.5 - KEY STAFF SCORING SUMMARY	12
TABLE 9.6 - KEY STAFF QUALIFICATIONS SCORING	13
TABLE 9.7 - KEY STAFF SCORES	13
TABLE 9.8 - KEY STAFF REFERENCES SCORING	14
TABLE 9.9 - KEY STAFF REFERENCE CHECK SCORES	15
TABLE 9.10 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT SCORING	16
TABLE 9.11 - TECHNICAL SOLUTION SCORING	17
TABLE 9.12 - DEMONSTRATION REQUIREMENTS SCORING	18
TABLE 9.13 - TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORES	20
TABLE 9.14 - FUNCTIONAL SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE	21
TABLE 9.15 - COST SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE	24
TABLE 9.16 - TOTAL SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE	25

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

9 EVALUATION

9.1 Introduction

This section defines the process for the evaluation of proposals offered in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). This section documents the procedures and checklists that will be used to ensure that Bidder selection provides the best value solution for the State. This section covers the evaluation process, starting from the day that Draft Proposals are due, to the release of the Notice of Intent to Award.

9.2 Evaluation Team

The State will establish an Evaluation Team comprised of individuals selected from Department of General Services (DGS), Office of Systems Integration (OSI), Department of Technology Services (DTS), and Employment Development Department (EDD) management, staff, and their representatives. The Evaluation Team is responsible for the review and evaluation of Bidder proposals in accordance with the process described in this section. The State may engage additional qualified individuals during the process to assist the Evaluation Team in gaining a better understanding of technical, legal, contractual, or program issues.

9.3 Proposal Process

The Unemployment Insurance Modernization (UIMOD) Project is using the multi-step procurement process as outlined in RFP Section 2, Rules Governing Competition. The evaluation of Bidder proposals will follow the steps below:

1. Bidder Submissions of Draft Proposals
2. Evaluation of Draft Proposals
3. Confidential Discussions
4. Bidder Submissions of Final Proposals
5. Evaluation of Final Proposals, excluding Demonstrations
6. Demonstrations
7. Cost Opening
8. Cost Evaluation

Deleted: <#>Demonstrations¶

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

9.3.1 Submission Review

The Evaluation Team will conduct a proposal submission administrative review at each proposal submission to ensure the proposal satisfies requirements of RFP Section 8, Proposal and Bid Format.

Absence of required information in the Final Proposal may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive and may be cause for rejection.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

9.3.2 Draft Proposal Review

The Evaluation team will conduct a compliance review on the Draft Proposals to ensure that the proposals meet all the mandatory requirements. The Evaluation Team will also document areas in which the Bidder's proposal appears to:

1. Be non-responsive to the RFP requirements
2. Require additional clarification
3. Have inconsistencies
4. Not comply with the proposal requirements
5. Be missing proposal components

NOTE: THE PRESENCE OF ANY COST DATA IN THE DRAFT PROPOSAL MAY RESULT IN BIDDER DISQUALIFICATION.

The State will review the proposal package to identify any “qualifiers” placed on the proposal. Conditional proposals are not acceptable.

9.3.3 Confidential Discussion

After the submission and review of the Draft Proposals, a date and time for a Confidential Discussion will be scheduled for each Bidder to discuss items identified during the Draft Proposal review. For specific information see RFP Section 2, Rules Governing Competition.

The Evaluation team will discuss with each Bidder confidentially, the items identified in their proposal which may not meet proposal requirements, or may require further clarification by the Bidder. All items discussed during the Confidential Discussions are considered confidential and will not be distributed to all Bidders. Items discussed will be constrained to the points of reference in the Bidder's Draft Proposal. The State may add discussion items, as noted on the Discussion Agenda, to be sent to all Bidders in advance.

The Bidder will be expected to keep the appointment time and date set for the Confidential Discussion. Any Bidder not appearing for an appointed Confidential Discussion will not be allowed to reschedule its appointment, except in cases of unforeseen circumstances, which shall be considered by the State on a case-by-case basis.

The State does not warrant that all defects will be detected, and such notification does not preclude the rejection of the Final Proposal due to errors subsequently identified and those remaining in the Final Proposal.

9.3.4 Final Proposal Review

During evaluation of the Final Proposal, the Evaluation Team may request help from the Bidder to locate information in the proposal and to clarify the Bidder's intent if the proposal appears to contain conflicting information. However, this request for

clarification is **not** an opportunity for the Bidder to change or add material to its proposal.

The Final Proposal review will consist of two parts:

1. Compliance Review - verify that the Bidder addressed all mandatory requirements and met all mandatory pass/fail requirements.

All proposal requirements are categorized as either Mandatory or Desirable requirements. A Bidder **MUST** respond to all Mandatory requirements. The Bidder's responses to Mandatory requirements will be evaluated either as pass/fail or will receive a score based on how well the Bidder's response addresses the requirement.

The Bidder **MAY CHOOSE** to respond to Desirable requirements. The Bidder's proposal is not required to meet the requirement to be considered responsive, but the Bidder's proposal will receive evaluation points based on the response.

The Evaluation Team will review the following components of the Bidder's proposal to determine whether it addressed all Mandatory requirements and met all pass/fail requirements:

- a) Administrative Requirements (RFP Section 5)
- b) Project Management Requirements (RFP Section 6A)
- c) System Engineering Requirements. (RFP Section 6B)
- d) Technical Solution Requirements (RFP Section 6C)
- e) Deliverables and Acceptance Process. (RFP Section 6D)
- f) Proposal Requirements (RFP Section 6E)

If a proposal fails to address any Mandatory requirement or contains any "qualifiers", the proposal may be considered non-responsive and may be rejected. The Bidder's proposal must pass all Mandatory requirements evaluated on a pass/fail basis. If the Bidder's proposal **DOES NOT MEET** the requirement, the Bidder's proposal will be considered non-responsive.

2. Scoring Review - assigns the Bidder's proposal a score for all scored Mandatory and Desirable requirements.

The Evaluation Team will review and evaluate all responses to scored Mandatory requirements and to Desirable requirements. Each requirement will receive points based on the response and evaluation criteria. Refer to RFP Section 6E, RFP Proposal Requirements, and RFP Section 10, Demonstration, for the maximum points available for each scored requirement.

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

9.4 Proposal Evaluation Scoring (Total Score)

The Total Score (Best Value to the State) is evaluated based on a maximum of 10,000 points which is the sum of the Total Functional Score and the Cost Score as shown in [Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary](#), not including any additional points that may be awarded for applicable preferences and the Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Incentive (see Section 5.11, Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Program).

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

The Total Functional Score is the sum of the three (3) category scores for Corporate Capability, Key Staff, and Technical Proposal. In turn, each category score consists of the sum of the scores for proposal items required for that category. Each proposal item score is the sum of the scores for individual requirements within that item. The Bidder's Total Functional Score will be determined from the total Functional points earned by the Bidder's proposal out of the maximum 5,000 Functional points available. The Bidder who scores the highest score under the Functional evaluation category will receive the full 5,000 points. Point allocations for the remaining Bidders will be based on a prorated calculation described herein.

The Total Cost Score available is 5,000 points and will be awarded based on the Bidder's total costs for the four cost categories identified. The Bidder's Total Cost Score will be determined from the total Cost points earned by the Bidder's proposal out of the maximum 5,000 Cost points available. The lowest combined cost under the Cost evaluation categories will receive the full 5,000 points. Point allocations for the remaining Bidders will be based on a prorated calculation described herein.

Hence, the maximum available points, prior to applying any available preferences or the DVBE Incentive is 10,000. A Bidder can exceed this maximum only by applying and qualifying for any preferences (i.e. – Small Business Preference) and/or a DVBE Incentive.

[Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary](#), that follows lists all points available to Bidders by category and also shows the minimum points required, also referred to as “minimum thresholds”, where applicable. The minimum thresholds, where applicable, are equal to sixty percent (60%) of the available points in the category.

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Proposals that do not obtain a score equal or greater to the minimum thresholds in each category, by the Final Proposal due date, will be deemed non-compliant.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Category	Percentage of Total Points Available	Maximum Points Available	Threshold Minimum Points Required (60% of Total)	Requirement Category
Corporate Background and Experience *	0%	0	N/A	Mandatory
Mandatory Corporate *	0%	0	N/A	Mandatory
Desirable Corporate	2.5%	250	N/A	Desirable
Customer References	2.5%	250	N/A	Mandatory
Total Corporate Capability	5%	500		
Key Staff Qualifications Summary *	0%	0	N/A	Mandatory
Desirable Key Staff Qualifications	5%	500	N/A	Desirable
Key Staff References	5%	500	N/A	Mandatory
Total Key Staff	10%	1000		
Project Management Plan (PMP)	4.9%	490	294	Mandatory
System Engineering Management Plan (SEMP)	4%	400	240	Mandatory
Total Project Management	8.9%	890	534	
System Requirements Response	1.05%	105	63	Mandatory
UIMOD Solution Approach	7%	700	420	Mandatory
Prototype Approach	2.50%	250	150	Mandatory
Implementation Approach	5.25%	525	315	Mandatory
Knowledge Transfer & Training Approach	2%	200	120	Mandatory
Transition Approach	1.05%	105	63	Mandatory
Total Technical Solution	18.85%	1885	1131	
Production Call Center Demonstration	1.65%	165	99	Mandatory
Production UI Benefits System Demonstration	2.80%	280	168	Mandatory
High Performance Web Application System Demonstration	2.80%	280	168	Mandatory
Total Demonstration	7.25%	725	435	
Total Technical Proposal	35%	3500	2100	
Total Functional Score	50%	5000		
One Time Costs	Bidders shall identify costs for each of the four (4) categories. Costs for each of the categories will be totaled. The lowest total cost will be awarded the full 5000 points. The remaining bidders will receive a percentage of this amount. Costs will not be scored individually.			
Ongoing Costs				
Work Authorization Rates				
Mandatory Optional Contract Services				
Total Cost Score	50%	5000		
Total Score (Best Value)	100%	10,000		
Small Business Preference	Qualifying bids: 5% of the highest total score of the proposal that does not earn a Small Business Preference.			
Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Incentive	Qualifying bids: up to 7% (350 points) of the total cost points available. See Section 5.11.1, Table 5.1.			

* Listed to show all requirements for each category, even though no points are assigned.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

9.4.1 Scoring Thresholds

Each Bidder must score at least 60 percent (60%) of the available points for each proposal submittal in the Technical Proposal category and in each subcategory within the Technical Proposal category.

Proposals not meeting the minimum threshold scores indicated in [Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary](#) will be deemed non-compliant and will not proceed to the Demonstration or to the Cost Opening.

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

9.5 Functional Evaluation Scoring (5,000 Points)

9.5.1 Corporate Capability Evaluation

There are 500 points available for the Corporate Capability Requirements.

Points will be awarded for the degree to which the customer reference was satisfied with the Bidder's performance. Points will also be awarded for the Bidder's ability to meet identified Desirable requirements as specified in the Corporate Capability in RFP Section 6E, Proposal Requirements. Points are not awarded for items that are evaluated as pass/fail.

Table 9.2 - Corporate Capability Scoring

Corporate Capability Requirements	Points Available	Requirement Type
Corporate Background and Experience	0	Mandatory
Mandatory Corporate Requirements	0	Mandatory
Customer References for Bidder	250	Mandatory
Desirable Corporate Requirements	250	Desirable
Total	500	

9.5.1.1 Desirable Corporate Requirements

Each Desirable requirement for the Corporate Capability has been assigned a specific point value. The Desirable requirements assess specific details of the Corporate Capability requirement and will be used to establish the completeness and overall value to the State. For each requirement, the Evaluation Team will assign a rating of Yes or No. The table that follows will be used to calculate the points that will be awarded to the Bidder's proposal response.

Table 9.3 - Corporate Capability Scores

Rating	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Each Corporate Capability requirement will receive its associated value.

Example:

A proposal requirement is worth 30 points. If the Evaluation Team assigns a rating of Yes (1) to the requirement, the requirement receives 30 points (1 multiplied by 30 points). If the Evaluation Team assigns a rating of No (0) to the requirement, the requirement receives 0 points (0 multiplied by 30 points).

9.5.1.2 Customer References

The State will conduct customer reference checks for each Bidder. The reference checks will have a defined number of questions which will receive a score based on customer response. The same questions will be asked to all references. The questions will validate corporate experience stated in the proposal for that customer (non-scored) and assess customer satisfaction (scored). For each customer satisfaction question, the Evaluation Team will assign a rating based on the responses from the customer.

All reasonable attempts will be made to contact references. Any reference that cannot be contacted after two (2) attempts or does not respond to a message within three (3) business days will be considered invalid.

Evaluators will contact references in the order that Bidders rank them following instructions in Section 6E.1.1 Corporate Background and Experience. Evaluators will contact all references provided to validate Corporate Background and Experience. The first two (2) references contacted will be used to assess customer satisfaction. If evaluators are unable to contact two references to assess customer satisfaction, the Bidder's final score will be based on any reference that can be contacted.

The Bidder Customer Reference checks may include questions such as:

1. What was the Bidder's role on the project?
2. What was the scope and cost of the project?
3. Were you satisfied with the Bidders work?
4. Would you hire the Bidder again?
5. Did the Bidder complete work on schedule?
6. Did the Bidder complete work within budget?
7. Did the Bidders team work well with the customer team?
8. Did the Bidder escalate issues/problems in a timely manner?
9. Did the Bidder resolve software/hardware issues in accordance with established timeframes?

A percentage will be calculated based on the customer reference response. Table 9.4 – Corporate Capability Reference Check Scores below will be used to calculate the percentage score that will be awarded to the Bidder's proposal response. The sum of values from the two (2) reference checks will be divided by the total number of evaluation criteria to produce the percentage of points earned by the Bidder. This

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

percentage will then be multiplied by the maximum points available to determine the Bidder's final score for this category.

Table 9.4 - Corporate Capability Reference Check Scores

Rating	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Neither Agree or Disagree	3
Disagree	1
Strongly Disagree	0

Example:

The two (2) Customer Reference checks are worth up to 250 points as noted in [Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary](#).

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Deleted: Table 9.1 – Evaluation Scoring Summary

Assuming this category has five (5) evaluation criteria (EC) and Bidder A obtained the following scores.

Reference check 1 score: **17**

- EC 1 is scored Agree (4)
- EC 2 is scored Agree (4)
- EC 3 is scored Neither Agree or Disagree (3)
- EC 4 is scored Strongly Agree (5)
- EC 5 is scored Disagree (1)

Total score : 17

Reference check 2 score: **18**

In this example, there is a maximum score available of 50 (number of reference checks (2) times the maximum score (25) possible for each reference check). Based on the customer responses, the Bidder A will achieve 175 points out of a possible total of 250 points.

Bidder A Percentage Score = $((17+18) / 50) = 70\%$

Bidder A Total Points Score = $0.70 * 250$ (points available) = 175

9.5.2 Key Staff Evaluation

There are 1000 points available for the Key Staff Requirements. The State will contact references to validate each proposed Key Staff member's experience against the Key Staff Qualification requirements in RFP Section 6E, Proposal Requirements, through a confirmation with the provided reference for that qualification.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

The total years and months experience stated on the Qualifications Summary Form, must equal or exceed the experience documented in the Resume. If a discrepancy exists between the Qualifications Summary Form and the Resume, the Qualifications Summary Form takes precedence and is used in the evaluation and scoring calculation.

Evaluation points for Key Staff Qualifications are assigned for Desirable criteria met based on qualifications stated on the Key Staff's Qualifications Summary Form. Evaluation points for Key Staff References are assigned based on selection criteria for reference checks. Submission of all required Key Staff is mandatory. Proposals which do not meet all Mandatory Key Staff requirements will be disqualified and considered non-responsive.

The State will conduct customer reference checks for the Key Staff proposed by each Bidder. The reference checks will have a defined number of questions which will receive a score based on customer response. The same questions will be asked to all references. The questions will validate Key Staff experience stated in the proposal for that customer (non-scored) and assess customer satisfaction (scored). For each customer satisfaction question, the Evaluation Team will assign a rating based on the responses from the customer.

All reasonable attempts will be made to contact references. Any reference that cannot be contacted after two (2) attempts or does not respond to a message within three (3) business days will be considered invalid.

Evaluators will contact references in the order that Bidders rank them following instructions in Section 6E.2.1 Key Staff References. Evaluators will contact all references provided to validate Key Staff qualifications. The first two (2) references contracted will be used to assess customer satisfaction. If evaluators are unable to contact two references to assess customer satisfaction, the Bidder's final score will be based on any reference that can be contacted.

Table 9.5 - Key Staff Scoring Summary

Key Staff Requirement	Points Available	Requirement Type
Key Staff Qualifications Summary	0	Mandatory
Desirable Key Staff Qualifications	500	Desirable
Key Staff References	500	Mandatory
Total	1000	

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

9.5.2.1 Key Staff Qualifications

The following table illustrates the distribution of points within the category for Key Staff Qualifications.

Table 9.6 - Key Staff Qualifications Scoring

Key Staff Requirement	Points Available
Project Manager	75
Quality Assurance Manager	50
Project Scheduler	25
Contact Center Implementation/Deployment Manager	75
Contact Center Engineer/Architect	75
Software Development Manager	75
Sr. Software Architect (Technical Lead)	75
Database Designer	50
Total	500

Each Desirable requirement for the Key Staff Qualifications has been assigned a specific point value. Each Desirable requirement has a number of evaluation criteria that assess specific details of the Key Staff requirement and will be used to establish the completeness and overall value to the State. For each evaluation criteria, the Evaluation Team will assign a rating of Yes or No.

A percentage will be calculated based on the Evaluation Team's rating of the requirements evaluation criteria. [Table 9.7 - Key Staff Scores](#) below will be used to calculate the percentage of points that will be awarded to the Bidder's proposal response.

Deleted: Table 9.7 - Key Staff Scores

Deleted: Table 9.7 - Key Staff Scores

Table 9.7 - Key Staff Scores

Rating	Score
Yes	1
No	0

For a Key Staff requirement, each evaluation criteria rating will receive its associated value. The sum of those values will be divided by the number of evaluation criteria to determine the percentage of available points earned.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

Example:

A proposal requirement is worth up to 7 points and has five (5) evaluation criteria (EC).

- EC 1 is scored Yes (1)
- EC 2 is scored Yes (1)
- EC 3 is scored No (0)
- EC 4 is scored Yes (1)
- EC 5 is scored Yes (1)

There is a maximum possible score available of 5 (if the bidder was awarded Yes for all evaluation criteria). Based on the Evaluation Team's marks, the bidder scored 4 out of 5 which is equal to 80%. In this example the bidder would receive 80% of the points allocated to the proposal requirement, or 5.6 points.

9.5.2.2 Key Staff References

The following table illustrates the distribution of points within the category for Key Staff References.

Table 9.8 - Key Staff References Scoring

Key Staff Requirement	Points Available
Project Manager	75
Quality Assurance Manager	50
Project Scheduler	25
Contact Center Implementation/Deployment Manager	75
Contact Center Engineer/Architect	75
Software Development Manager	75
Sr. Software Architect (Technical Lead)	75
Database Designer	50
Total	500

The State will conduct two (2) customer reference checks for each of the Key Staff. The reference checks will have a defined number of questions which will receive a score based on customer response. The questions will validate Key Staff experience stated in the proposal for that customer (non-scored) and assess customer satisfaction (scored). For each customer satisfaction question, the Evaluation Team will assign a rating based on the responses from the customer.

A percentage will be calculated based on the customer reference response. [Table 9.9 - Key Staff Reference Check Scores](#) that follows will be used to calculate the percentage of points that will be awarded to the Bidder's proposal response. The sum of values from the two (2) reference checks will be divided by the total number

Deleted: Table 9.9 - Key Staff Reference Check Scores

Deleted: Table 9.9 - Key Staff Reference Check Scores

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

of evaluation criteria to produce the percentage of points earned by the Bidder. This percentage will then be multiplied by the maximum points available to determine the Bidder's final score for this category.

Table 9.9 - Key Staff Reference Check Scores

Rating	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Neither Agree or Disagree	3
Disagree	1
Strongly Disagree	0

Example:

A Key Staff Reference check is worth up to 75 points.

In this example, a requirement has a maximum score available of 30 and is worth a possible total of 75 points. The score is determined by the requirement having three (3) evaluation criteria worth a maximum available score of 15 points for each reference check. The number of reference checks (2) times the maximum score (15) possible for each reference check equals a score of 30. Based on the customer responses, the Bidder A will achieve 60 points from a possible total of 75 points.

Reference check 1, score: **11**

- EC 1 is scored Agree (4)
- EC 2 is scored Agree (4)
- EC 3 is scored Neither Agree or Disagree (3)

Total score: 11

Reference check 2 score: **15**

Based on the customer responses, the Bidder A will achieve a score of 26, and receive 87 percent of the points allocated to the proposal requirement, or 65 points.

Bidder A Percentage Score = $((11+15) / 30) = 87\%$

Bidder A Total Points Score = $0.87 * 75 = 65$

9.5.3 Technical Proposal Evaluation

The Bidder's Technical Proposal will consist of the Bidder's Project Management proposal, Technical Solution proposal, and Demonstrations.

9.5.3.1 Project Management Proposal

There is a maximum of 890 points available in the Project Management Proposal. The State will evaluate the Bidder's Project Management approach based on the mandatory proposal requirements in RFP Section 6E, Proposal Requirements.

Table 9.10 - Project Management Scoring

Project Management Requirement	Points Available	Threshold Minimum Points Required (60% of Total)	Requirement Type
Project Management Plan (PMP)	490	294	Mandatory
System Engineering Management Plan (SEMP)	400	240	Mandatory
Total	890	534	

Bidders must meet or exceed the minimum threshold scores for each category in the Final Proposal or their proposal will be deemed non-compliant and a demonstration will not be scheduled.

9.5.3.1.1 Project Management Plan (PMP)

The Project Management Plan evaluation will consider the following:

- Does support exist to justify the usefulness and ability of the bidder to successfully execute?
- How realistic and complete are the defined approaches?
- How well the Bidder processes fit and flow with the UIMOD business processes?
- How well has the Bidder adapted to the UIMOD environment?
- The correlation between the Master Schedule and the activities proposed in the Project Management Plan.
- The correlation between the Master Schedule and the resources proposed in the Project Management Plan.
- The accuracy and completeness of the activities identified to complete the task(s) and milestones.
- The accuracy and completeness of the task dependencies.
- The completeness of the Risk Management approach.
- Integration of the Quality Management processes into the overall project methodologies.

9.5.3.1.2 System Engineering Management Plan (SEMP)

The System Engineering Management Plan evaluation will consider the following:

- How well defined and proven are the proposed methodologies for task accomplishment?
- How realistic and complete are the defined approaches?
- How well do the Bidder processes fit and flow with the UIMOD technical processes?
- How well has the Bidder adapted to the UIMOD environment?

5. The accuracy and completeness of the activities identified to complete the task(s) and milestones.
6. The accuracy and completeness of the task dependencies.
7. The correlation between the Master Schedule and the activities proposed in the SEMP.
8. The correlation between the Master Schedule and the resources proposed in the SEMP.

9.5.3.2 Technical Solution Proposal

There are 1885 maximum points available for the Technical Solution Proposal. The State awards points for each Technical Solution Proposal response based on how well the Bidder meets or exceeds, by providing products or services that add value to the State, the proposal requirements in Section 6E, Proposal Requirements.

Table 9.11 - Technical Solution Scoring

Technical Solution Requirement	Points Available	Threshold Minimum Points Required (60% of Total)	Requirement Type
System Requirements Response	105	63	Mandatory
UIMOD Solution Approach	700	420	Mandatory
Prototype Approach	250	150	Mandatory
Implementation Approach	525	315	Mandatory
Knowledge Transfer & Training Approach	200	120	Mandatory
Transition Approach	105	63	Mandatory
Total	1885	1131	

Bidders must meet or exceed the minimum threshold scores for each category in the Final Proposal or their proposal will be deemed non-compliant and a demonstration will not be scheduled.

The evaluation of each submission in the Bidder's Technical Solution will consider the following:

1. Completeness of Conformance:
 - a) Conformance to UIMOD System Requirements (Do the documents reflect the UIMOD system requirements?).
 - b) Conformance to IEEE (Does the document meet the applicable IEEE standard?).
 - c) Conformance with the RFP Proposal Requirements.
2. Quality of Conformance:
 - a) Consistency (Does the document display an adequate level of quality? Is the technical methodology consistent throughout the document?).

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

3. Comfort Level with Technologies:
 - a) Experience with the technologies (How well does the Bidder understand the technologies that UIMOD will be using?).
 - b) Ability to be successful with technologies (Does the Bidder have previous experience with using the technologies in a successful effort?).
4. Comfort Level with Concepts:
 - a) How well does the Bidder understand the technical concepts and architecture that will be utilized on UIMOD?
 - b) How well does the Bidder understand the work to be done?
5. Comfort Level with Environment:
 - a) How well does the Bidder understand the State environment and how that may impact the way that a project is successful?
 - b) How well does the Bidder understand UI?
 - c) Does the Bidder have a thorough understanding of California UI business practices?

9.5.3.3 Demonstration

There are a maximum of 725 points available for the Demonstration. The State awards points for each Demonstration component based on whether or not the Bidder demonstrates the system functionality and characteristics described in the proposal requirements in RFP Section 10, Demonstration.

There are three (3) separate demonstration components:

1. Production Call Center Demonstration.
2. Production UI Benefits Web System Demonstration.
3. High Performance Production Web Application System Demonstration

Table 9.12 - Demonstration Requirements Scoring

Demonstration Requirement	Points Available	Threshold Minimum Points Required (60% of Total)	Requirement Type
Production Call Center Demonstration	165	99	Mandatory
Production UI Benefits Web System Demonstration	280	168	Mandatory
High Performance Production Web Application System Demonstration	280	168	Mandatory
Total	725	435	

Bidders must meet or exceed the minimum threshold scores for each category in the Final Proposal or their proposal will be deemed non-compliant and will not proceed to the Cost Opening.

Each of the demonstration components will be conducted as part of an on-site presentation to the Evaluation Team. The demonstration of all three (3) components

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

Deleted: has

will be scheduled to last no longer than a total of eight (8) hours, and the Bidders will be required to present in person, after their proposals have been deemed to have passed all other Mandatory requirements. See “Demonstrations” in the Key Action Dates in RFP Section 1, Introduction and Overview.

In their proposal response, the Bidders must include their responses for the requirements in RFP Section 10, Demonstration. See RFP Section 6E. 5, Demonstration for the proposal response requirement. **Failure to do so may result in the bid being deemed non-responsive.**

Each Bidder submitting a Final Proposal will be contacted after the Final Proposal submittal deadline to schedule the live demonstrations.

9.5.3.4 Technical Proposal Scoring

Each requirement for the technical proposal has been assigned a specific point value and has a number of evaluation criteria that assess specific details of the requirement and will be used to establish the completeness and overall value to the State.

The Demonstration portion of the technical proposal is scored differently than the Project Management and Technical Solution portions. The Bidders Demonstration will be evaluated and scored based on the functionality and work products demonstrated. Bidders are not required to demonstrate all functionality for each of the three (3) Demonstration components, but must achieve 60 percent of the total points for each Demonstration component. See Table 9.12 – Demonstration Requirements Scoring for information on the minimum points required for each Demonstration component.

Example:

A proposal Demonstration component is worth up to 200 points. There are 5 functions requested to be demonstrated. Each of the 5 functional requirements has the following points assigned to each:

- Functional requirement 1 is 40 points
- Functional requirement 2 is 60 points
- Functional requirement 3 is 50 points
- Functional requirement 4 is 30 points
- Functional requirement 5 is 20 points

Bidder A demonstrates functional requirements 1, 2, 3, and 5 earning a score of 170 points for this Demonstration component.

For the Project Management and Technical Solution portions of the technical proposal, the Evaluation Team will assign a rating of Fully Meets, Adequately Meets, Incomplete or Fails for each evaluation criteria. A percentage will be calculated based on the Evaluation Team’s rating of the requirements evaluation criteria.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Table 9.14 – Technical Proposal Scores below will be used to calculate the percentage of points that will be awarded to the Bidder's proposal response.

Table 9.13 - Technical Proposal Scores

Rating	Score
Fully Meets	10
Adequately Meets	8
Incomplete	5
Fails	0

For a scored proposal requirement, each evaluation criteria rating will receive its associated value. The sum of those values will be divided by the number of evaluation criteria to determine the percentage of available points earned.

Example:

A proposal requirement is worth up to 25 points and has four (4) evaluation criteria (EC).

- EC 1 is scored Fully Meets (10)
- EC 2 is scored Adequately Meets (8)
- EC 3 is scored Adequately Meets (8)
- EC 4 is scored Fails (0).

There is a maximum evaluation score available of 40 (if the bidder was awarded fully meets for all 4 evaluation criteria). If the bidder scored 26 out of 40, they would receive 65% of the points allocated to the proposal requirement or 16.25 points.

9.5.4 Functional Scoring Determination

The Functional Score represents 50 percent (50%) of the total points attainable in the RFP evaluation process. The maximum Functional Score is 5000 points which is determined based on the sum of the points earned among the three (3) categories of Corporate Capability, Key Staff, and Technical Proposal.

The table below is an example of how the cost scoring would be calculated for three (3) Bidders A, B, and C.

Table 9.14 - Functional Score Calculation Example

Bidder	Corporate Capability Score	Key Staff Score	Technical Proposal Score	Total Raw Functional Score	Adjusted Functional Score
A	300 points	600 points	2100 points	3000 points	3432 points
B	380 points	760 points	2960 points	4100 points	4690 points
C	437 points	874 points	3060 points	4371 points	5000 points

A Bidder's raw Functional score is based on the sum of their three individual raw scores (Corporate Capability, Key Staff, and Technical Proposal), with the Bidder having highest overall Total Raw Score receiving the full 5000 points (called the Adjusted Functional Score). Points for the other Bidders are awarded as follows:

Bidder A: 300 points + 600 points + 2100 points = 3000 points

$\frac{3000 \text{ points (Bidder A's score)}}{4371 \text{ points (highest score)}} \times 5000 \text{ points} = 3432 \text{ points}$

Bidder B: 380 points + 760 points + 2960 points = 4100 points

$\frac{4100 \text{ points (Bidder B's score)}}{4371 \text{ points (highest score)}} \times 5000 \text{ points} = 4690 \text{ points}$

Bidder C: 437 points + 874 points + 3060 points = 4371 points

$\frac{4371 \text{ points (Bidder C's score)}}{4371 \text{ points (highest score)}} \times 5000 \text{ points} = 5000 \text{ points}$

9.6 Cost Evaluation Scoring (5,000 Points)

A public Cost Opening will be scheduled by DGS where Cost Proposals will be opened and documented for all proposals that have been deemed compliant by the Evaluation Team. DGS will contact each Bidder with the scheduled date and time for the public Cost Opening. Each qualifying proposal's costs will be available for

evaluation as defined below. Those proposals that have been deemed non-compliant with RFP requirements will be returned to the Bidders unopened.

9.6.1 Evaluation for Compliance to RFP Requirements

The Evaluation Team will evaluate the Cost Proposals for compliance with RFP requirements as noted below.

9.6.1.1 Cost Requirements Evaluation

The Cost Requirements Evaluation of the Final Proposal focuses on ensuring that the following requirements are met:

1. The Bidder's cost information includes costs of staff, services, software purchase/lease/license, hardware, and tools to meet the requirements defined in this RFP.
2. The additional hardware and/or software items presented are consistent with and include all of the items identified in the Technical Solution and elsewhere in the proposal submitted in response to RFP Section 6E, Proposal Requirements.
3. Costs, quantities, and extensions are checked for any mathematical errors. Any errors in the Cost Proposal will be corrected in accordance with RFP Section 2.3.9.3 Errors in the Final Proposal.
4. Any calculated fields in the Bidder's hard copy Cost Proposal should match those in the Bidder's submitted soft copy Cost Worksheets. The Evaluation Team will, in addition, re-enter the Bidder's data from the hard copy Cost Proposal into its own copy of the Cost Worksheets for verification. If there are differences, the Evaluation Team will make corrections as allowed in RFP Section 2, Rules Governing Competition.
5. After all Cost Proposals are evaluated, the Evaluation Team will meet to calculate the Cost Score, taking into account Bidder Program Preferences claimed, and/or the DVBE Incentive, as applicable.

IT IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL THAT BIDDERS CAREFULLY REVIEW THE COST ELEMENTS IN THEIR FINAL PROPOSAL, SINCE THEY WILL NOT HAVE THE OPTION TO CHANGE THEM AFTER THE FINAL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL.

9.6.1.2 Consistency with the Technical Solution

The Evaluation Team will evaluate the Cost Proposals for consistency with their Technical Solution proposal. Cost proposals that deviate materially from their Technical Solution proposal may be considered non-responsive.

9.6.1.3 State Data Center Services Cost Evaluation

State Data Center Services costs are those required to provide the UIMOD infrastructure required to meet the RFP requirements and proposed technical solution. State Data Center Services costs may include:

1. Physical data center environment costs.

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

2. Server hardware and software operation and support costs.
3. Server storage and usage costs.
4. Media handling and storage costs.
5. Wide Area Network costs.

The Bidder is expected to work directly with the DTS State Data Center for data center services information as specified in RFP Section 1.9, Department of Technology Services Discussions (State Data Center Services).

As part of the Cost Evaluation, the Cost Requirements evaluation team, with assistance from the State Data Center subject matter experts, will evaluate the Cost Proposal to verify that the descriptions, quantities and costs of State Data Center services are consistent with State Data Center Statement of Work, Network Services Statement of Work, State Data Center Service Standards, and "Base Rate Schedule" and "Rates Guide" available at <http://www.uimodrfp.ca.gov>. The Cost Requirements evaluation team, with assistance from the State Data Center subject matter experts, will evaluate if the quantities are consistent with the proposed technical solution.

9.6.1.4 Preference Program Evaluation

The Cost Score of each Bidder's Final Proposal will be determined after any Preference Program adjustments as described in RFP Section 5, Administrative Requirements, such as the DVBE Incentive, if applicable. Once all Total Evaluated Costs of Ownership are determined, the Evaluation Team will calculate the Cost Score for each responsive Bidder.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

9.6.2 Cost Scoring Determination

The Cost Score represents 50 percent (50%) of the total points attainable in the RFP evaluation process, not including points that may be earned by Bidders for any applicable preferences or the DVBE Incentive. The maximum Cost Score is 5000 points which is determined based on the sum of the costs among the five (5) cost categories of One Time Costs (including contractor services, hardware, software, telecommunications and training), Ongoing Costs (including hardware, software, and telecommunications), Data Center Costs (one time and ongoing), Work Authorization Costs, and Mandatory-Optional (M-O) Support Contract Costs.

Deleted: our

Deleted: 4

Deleted: ,

Costs to be evaluated will be an estimate of the total cost of ownership of the implementation period plus five (5) years of ongoing costs. The table below is an example of how the cost scoring would be calculated for three (3) Bidders A, B, and C.

Table 9.15 - Cost Score Calculation Example

Bidder	One Time Proposal Cost	Ongoing Proposal Cost	Work Authorization Cost	Mandatory Optional Contract Cost	Total Cost	Bidder Cost Score
A	\$19,000,000	\$9,500,000	\$950,000	\$1,900,000	\$31,350,000	5000 points
B	\$27,250,000	\$10,000,000	\$1,362,500	\$2,725,000	\$41,337,500	3792 points
C	\$29,750,000	\$12,000,000	\$1,487,500	\$2,975,000	\$46,212,500	3392 points

A Bidder's Cost score is based on the sum of their four (4) individual costs, with the Bidder having lowest overall cost receiving the full 5000 points. Points for the other Bidders are awarded as follows:

Note also that because Bidder A in this example has the lowest overall cost, they receive the full 5,000 points.

Bidder A: $\$19,000,000 + \$9,500,000 + \$950,000 + \$1,900,000 = \$31,350,000$

$\frac{\$31,350,000 \text{ (lowest cost)} \times 5000 \text{ points}}{\$31,350,000 \text{ (Bidder A's cost)}} = 5000 \text{ points}$

Bidder B: $\$27,250,000 + \$10,000,000 + \$1,362,500 + \$2,725,000 = \$41,337,500$

$\frac{\$31,350,000 \text{ (lowest cost)} \times 5000 \text{ points}}{\$41,337,500 \text{ (Bidder B's cost)}} = 3792 \text{ points}$

Bidder C: $\$29,750,000 + \$12,000,000 + \$1,487,500 + \$2,975,000 = \$46,212,500$

$\frac{\$31,350,000 \text{ (lowest cost)} \times 5000 \text{ points}}{\$46,212,500 \text{ (Bidder C's cost)}} = 3392 \text{ points}$

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC

Deleted: OSI 7100-181

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Deleted: SECTION 9

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, All caps

9.7 Determination of Winning Proposal

The winning proposal is the responsive proposal that has the highest Total Score (Best Value to the State) which is the sum of the Total Functional Score, the Cost Score and any applicable preference [and/or DVBE Incentive](#) points.

Table 9.16 - Total Score Calculation Example

Bidder	Adjusted Functional Score*	Cost Score	Total Score Based on Response	Small Business Preference	DVBE Incentive	Total Final Score	Winning Bidder
A	3432	5000	8432	N/A	N/A	8432	
B	4690	3792	8482	422	N/A	8904	B
C	5000	3392	8392	N/A	250	8642	

*Adjusted Functional Scores are taken from the example of [Table 9.14 - Functional Score Calculation Example](#).

Deleted: Table 9.14 - Functional Score Calculation Example

Deleted: Table 9.14 - Functional Score Calculation Example

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Check spelling and grammar

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Bidder B is also a California certified Small Business and none of the other Bidders claimed the Small Business preference.

Highest Score (non-Small Business) * 5% = Small Business Preference

$$8432 * .05 = 422 \text{ points}$$

Bidder C certified California DVBE participation of 4% and qualifies for a DVBE Incentive of 5%. The total cost points available are 5000 points. (Refer to RFP Section 5, Administrative Requirements, for DVBE point scale.)

Total Cost Points Available * 5% = DVBE Incentive

$$5000 * .05 = 250 \text{ points.}$$

In this example, Bidder B would be the winning Bidder.

Deleted: 2347_35.DOC